

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:	Confirmation No.: 3996
Kazuo MIYAGAWA, et al.	Group Art Unit: 3618
Application No.: 10/564,034	Examiner: PHAN, Hau Van
Filed: January 10, 2006	Attorney Docket No.: 107355-00145
For: POWER UNIT MOUNTING ASSEMBLING METHOD AND APPARATUS	

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

MAIL STOP

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

April 21, 2008

Sir:

Applicants' representative, Bogdan Zinchenko, conducted a telephone interview in connection with the above-referenced matter with Examiner Phan on April 18, 2008. The courtesies extended to the Applicants' representative during the telephone interview are appreciated.

During the interview, Applicants' representative addressed the April 10, 2008, Advisory Action.

The Advisory Action indicated that the March 19, 2008, Amendment will not be entered because it raises new issues that would require further consideration and search. The Examiner, on the continuation sheet of the Advisory Action, specifically stated the following.

The proposed amendment with respect to “wherein said on-board removed from between said sub-frame and said power unit after the end of said third step” in claim 1 and “a removal member for removing said on-board mount from said sub-frame and said power unit after supporting said power unit on said car body frame via said mount” in claim 7, require further search and reconsideration.

However, the March 19, 2008, Amendment does not include any features that have not been previously recited in the claims. As indicated in the first paragraph in the Remarks section of the Amendment, claims 1 and 7 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of canceled claims 2 and 8, respectively. The subject matter of canceled claims 2 and 8 was recited in said claims in the application as originally filed. Moreover, as evidenced by the rejection of claim 2 and allowance of claim 8 in the November 20, 2007, Office Action, the subject matter of claims 2 and 8 has already been considered by Examiner Phan. As such, the March 19, 2008, Amendment, which incorporates the features of claims 2 and 8 into claims 1 and 7, respectively, does not raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search, and thus, should be entered.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicants’ representative asserted that the Advisory Action was improper and requested that Examiner Phan enter the March 19, 2008, Amendment.

In response, Examiner Phan acknowledged the deficiencies of the April 10, 2008, Advisory Action and indicated that he will enter the March 19, 2008, Amendment and issue a Patent Office communication within two weeks of the telephone interview date of April 18, 2008, indicating that the March 19, 2008, Amendment has been entered.

Respectfully submitted,



Bogdan A. Zinchenko
Registration Number 57,473

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

BAZ